DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 523 CS 506 887

AUTHOR Walker, James R.; Bellamy, Robert V., Jr.
TITLE The Gratifications of Grazing: Why Flippers Flip.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (75th, San Francisco, CA, November 18-21, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Factor Analysis; Higher Education; Mass Media Effects; *Mass Media Use; Regression (Statistics); Technological Advancement; Television Research; Television Surveys; *Television Viewing; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS Gratifications Obtained; Memphis State University TN; *Remote Control Devices; Uses and Gratifications Research

ABSTRACT

An exploratory study focused on usage patterns of television remote control devices (RCDs), examining how and why individuals use television RCDs to "graze." The study identified the gratifications obtained from RCD use and evaluated their relative importance in accounting for variations in RCD use. Subjects were 455 undergraduates in communication and theater courses at Memphis State University who responded to questionnaires measuring predictor variables (general background, general foreground), media reference background variables, (television exposure, cable television use, and VCR use), media reference foreground variables, and criterion variables (total RCD use, grazing, and multiple program viewing). Results indicated that certain RCD gratifications (getting more from television, avoiding commercials, selective avoidance, and finding out what is on television) were strongly related to RCD use. The strongest gratification produced by the factor analysis was for the selective avoidance of unpleasant stimuli, including politicians, political ads, news reporters, and others. The use of this particular age group probably reduced the impact of demographic variables and increased the significance of certain kinds of gratifications. (Three tables of data are included, and 40 references are attached.) (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311523

THE GRATIFICATIONS OF GRAZING:

WHY FLIPPERS FLIP

James R. Walker
143 Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
901-678-2565

and

Robert V. Bellamy, Jr.
Department of Communication
Des Places Communication Center
Duquesne University
Pittsburgh, PA 15282
412-434-6446

A paper presented at
the convention of the
Speech Communication Association
San Francisco, CA
November, 1989.

CS506887

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James R. Walker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE GRATIFICATIONS OF GRAZING: WHY FLIPPERS FLIP

One of the most consistent trends in mass communication research has been to study the "new" technologies in electronic media. This trend has accelerated in the last fifteen years due to two interrelated factors:

1) Technological diffusion has accelerated to a degree unknown previously. The invention and innovation of computers, geosynchronous satellites, fibre optics, and digital data transmission systems, among others, have made products and services available to the home and business consumer at a much faster pace than ever before (Rogers, 1986; Williams, 1989).

2) The U.S. government through its policies of deregulation and tax breaks to corporations have accelerated the flow of new media and information technologies into the economy. Although the government has not abandoned all policies protecting existing industrial structures, the loosening of restrictions on "new" technologies has increased opportunities for new entities in television/radio and traditional telecommunications services to gain entry into traditionally oligopolistic industries such as television or, in the case of telephony, essentially monopolistic industries (Horwitz, 1989).

Research on new technology has included studies of diffusion (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971); Rogers, 1986), uses and gratifications (Becker & Schoenbach, 1989; Levy & Gunter, 1988;

Rubin & Bantz, 1987; Williams, Phillips, & Lum, 1985), and effects on both the audience/users (Boyd, Straubhaar, & Lent, 1989; Greenberg & Heeter, 1987; and Kim, Baran, & Massey, 1988) and industrial structures (Heeter & Greenberg, 1985; Salmons, 1982; Walker, 1988; Yorke & Kitchen, 1985). Although the research approaches to new technologies have ranged from purely descriptive studies to complicated research designs, new technology scholars recognize that the products of technology are crucial variables in our understanding of the communication industries (e.g., Palmgreen, Wenner, & Rosengren, 1985, p. 17), and that these products have or will have great impact on audiences (e.g., Williams, 1983; Williams, et al., 1985, pp. 249-52).

Research on Television Technologies and Remote Control Devices

Much of the research on new media technologies has concentrated on television, and more specifically, cable (Grotta & Newsom, 1982; Sparkes, 1983) or Video Cassette Recorders (Boyd, et al., 1989; Greenberg & Heeter, 1987; Levy, 1980a; Levy, 1980b; Levy, 1981; Levy, 1987; Levy & Gunter, 1988; and Rubin & Bantz, 1987). This is not surprising because both of these technologies serve as conduits for an explosion in the availability of programming. As such, both cable and VCRs are "extensions" of the popular existing technology of broadcasting (Williams, 1989, pp. 122-24). In addition, VCRs give their users a large measure of control over their media- environment through time-shifting and special effects. A VCR can be regarded as a "tool technology" (Rogers, 1986, p. 120) which allows the controller to

use it for various purposes. The power of VCRs to both extend the reach and influence of existing television institutions (Levy, 1980; Williams, et al., 1985) and change the media environment has made it a major concern of both academic and industry researchers (e.g., Ainslie, 1988b; Salmons, 1982).

The television Remote Control Device (RCD) is another tool technology that expands the power of the user over the media environment, but one that has received minimal attention in either academic or popular literature. There are two main reasons for this. First, RCDs are not that new, having been introduced by the Zenith corporation in 1955 (Burghi, 1988). Second, they are extensions of existing media rather than conduits for programming and research has tended to focus on technologies that increase program diversity (i.e., cable, VCRs). However, RCDs are tools that allow the controller to make more frequent and personally gratifying use of a programming conduit.

The neglect of RCDs by communication researchers is unfortunate because one of the most fascinating aspects of the study of new technology is the refinement and enhancement of existing technology (Williams, 1989). RCDs are a form of machine assisted media manipulation (MAMM) which increases the utility of all other video technology. For example, there is evidence that cable and VCR penetration and usage statistics would be smaller without RCDs (Ainslie, 1988a; Salmons, 1982). Although some researchers have mentioned the importance of RCDs to such concepts as "zipping" through recorded material, "zapping"

commercials by instantaneous channel changing, and "grazing" through many program options through the use of RCDs (Heeter & Greenberg, 1985; Salmons, 1982; Ainslie, 1988a), the general pattern in research has been to ignore the RCD. The purpose of this study is to redress the neglect of RCDs by focussing on the usage patterns of this essential tool technology.

RCDs and Gratifications Research

Of concern here is how and why individuals use television Remote Control Devices to "graze." The audience-centered uses and gratifications approach is appropriate for this exploratory study because, as a "tool" technology, RCDs require a high degree of activity if the user is to reap the benefits of the technology. As other new technology researchers have noted, "[the] notion of an active audience forms the foundation of the uses and gratifications mass communication perspective (Rubin & Bantz, 1987, p. 471)." In addition, the uses and gratifications approach has been employed in several other studies of new technology which gives us a base of knowledge from which to develop the present study (Becker & Schoenbach, 1989; Levy & Gunter, 1988; and Rubin & Bantz, 1987). Developing an understanding of the patterns and parameters of usage will enable us to make some informed judgments as to the impact of RCDs on the media behavior of the users.

Research on the linkage between media gratifications and media effects is well established in the literature. The most recent comprehensive review of media gratifications research identified over 20 "uses and effects" studies (Palmgreen et al., 1985). According to the editors,

> these studies have shown that a variety of audience gratifications . . . are related to a wide spectrum of media effects, including knowledge, dependency, attitudes, perceptions of social reality, agenda-setting, discussion, and various political effects variables. (p. 31)

Since ours is an exploratory study, we first sought to identify the gratifications obtained from RCD use and then to evaluate their relative importance in accounting for variations in RCD use. Although more broadly defined general media gratifications models (Palmgreen et al., 1985) are available, we chose a more focused transactional model of the gratifications/effects (McLeod & Becker, 1974; Wenner, 1985). The transactional model provides an especially useful means of evaluating the relative importance of media gratifications. Wenner proposes that the use of transactional models in media gratifications research can serve as a useful guide to the hierarchical ordering of media effects predictors. His general transactional model identifies four general sets of media effects predictors that might be included in media effects studies: general background, general foreground, media reference background, and media reference foreground variables.

The individual's general background includes the "social and psychological needs and values" usually accounted for by demographic variables. General foreground "includes those less well-entrenched aspects of the individual that do not pertain to the area under investigation," including attitudes related to, but not about, particular effects. Media reference background includes "habitual media exposure" as well as exposure to non-media sources of need satisfaction. Media reference foreground includes "gratifications sought, modified by media content and the context of exposure, and resulting in gratifications obtained" (Wenner, 1985, pp. 90-92). Wenner argues that studies of the gratifications and effects should be hierarchically arranged, starting with general background variables, then including general foreground variables, media reference background variables, and finally media reference foreground variables.

In this exploratory study, the general transactional model has been applied to RCD behavior. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to evaluate the relative importance of general background, general foreground, media reference background, and media reference foreground variables in accounting for variations in the time spent flipping from channel to channel (grazing), the time spent watching more than one program at a time (multiple-program viewing), and total RCD use (both grazing and multiple-program viewing). Previous gratifications theory and research suggests that:

H1: Media reference foreground variables (RCD gratifications)

will account for significant variation in RCD use even after the impact of general background, general foreground, and media reference background variables has been accounted for.

Method

Subjects

Since our exploratory study was designed to ascertain the variety of gratifications sought by RCD users, a population with a high percentage of heavy RCD users, such as university students, was appropriate. Because of their age, income, and level of education (Rogers, 1986, p. 134; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971, pp. 185-89), undergraduates are frequently early adopters and heavy users of new technology. The respondents were 455 students enrolled in undergraduate communication and theatre courses at Memphis State University (n = 252) and Duquesne University (n = 203). The sample was 61.1% female, 87% White, with a mean age of 21.1 years. The median annual household income was between $40,000 and $60,000.

Questionnaires were administered during regular classes by course instructors, following written instructions. Respondents were told only that the purpose of the questionnaire was to gather information about student attitudes on topics of national interest. Missing data for each variable (4.2% of respondents for household income and less than 2% of respondents for all other variables) were set to the variable median.

Predictor Variables

General Background Variables

Demographic variables included sex, race, age, and household

income. Six household income categories were used: below $12,000, $12,000 to $19,000, $19,000 to $30,000, $30,000 to $40,000, $40,000 to $60,000, and over $60,000 per year.

General Foreground Variable

An index of television affinity (alpha = .79) was constructed by summing each respondent's scores for five, six-point Likert items (Rubin, 1981; Rubin & Rubin, 1982). The items were:

1. Watching TV is one of the most important things I do each day.
2. If the TV wasn't working, I would not miss it.
3. I would rather watch TV than do anything else.
4. I could easily do without television for several days.
5. I would feel lost without television to watch.

The scoring for items 2 and 4 was reversed so that for all items six was the most positive score and one was the most negative.

Media Reference Background Variables

Television Exposure Television exposure was measured by summing two proportionally weighted items: one measuring the number of hours watched during a typical weekday (M = 2.74, SD = 2.46) and one measuring the number of hours watched during a typical weekend day (M = 3.86, SD = 3.00).

Cable Television Use

Cable television use measured using one open-ended item: What percentage of the time you spend watching television is spent watching cable channels? (M = 43.1, SD = 31.9)

VCR Use

VCR use measured using one open-ended item:

What percentage of the time you spend watching television is spent watching a VCR? (M = 23.7, SD = 22.6)

Media Reference Foreground Variables

Although previous work that sought the uses and gratifications of other new technologies (Levy & Gunter, 1988, pp. 16-17; Williams, et al., 1985, pp. 249-52) was useful in developing our survey instruments, the exploratory nature of this study led us to a two-step method. First, 75 undergraduate students from Memphis State University and Duquesne University completed an open-ended questionnaire that sought reasons for channel changing, channel flipping, multiple program viewing, and other RCD related behaviors.

The information gained from this survey was used to develop 12 gratification categories: 1) control over television environment, 2) advertising avoidance, 3) playing with the buttons, 4) catching information quickly, 5) taking a music break, 6) not getting off sofa/out of chair, 7) annoying other viewers, 8) just seeing the good parts, 9) avoiding personalities/issues/programs, 10) avoiding boredom, 11) checking out what is on, and 12) getting the most out of television/cable/VCR. Forty-seven statements (see Table 2) were generated by the researchers based on these 12 categories. A six point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = mildly disagree, 4 = mildly agree, 5= agree, 6 = strongly agree) was used for each item. Using a factor analysis, these 47 items were reduced to seven distinct RCD gratifications (see Results).

Criterion Variables

Total RCD Use

An index of RCD use was made by summing each respondent's z-scores for five items (alpha = .81). Items 1-3 had four possible responses: (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) often, (4) very often:

1. During at typical hour of TV viewing, how often do you change the channel? (M = 3.36, SD = 1.01)
2. When you watch television, how often do you use the remote control to flip from channel to channel? (M = 3.86, SD = 1.25)
3. When you watch television, how often do you use the remote control to switch channels so you can follow more than one program at a time? (M = 2.64, SD = 1.14)

Items 4 and 5 were open-ended:

4. Some people like to use the remote control to flip from channel to channel. What percentage of the time you spend watching television is spent flipping from channel to channel? (M = 28.7, SD = 27.7)
5. Some people like to watch two or more programs at the same time using a remote control. What percentage of the time you spend watching television is spent watching two or more programs at the same time? (M = 15.6, SD = 20.9)

Grazing

An index of grazing was made by summing each respondent's z-scores for items 2 and 4 (alpha = .60).

Multiple-Program Viewing

An index of multiple-program viewing was made by summing each respondent's z-scores for items 3 and 5 (alpha = .74).

Results

Descriptive Data

Means and standard deviations for the 47 RCD gratification items are ranked from highest mean to lowest in Table 1.

Table 1 about here

Gratifications with the highest means include the use of RCDs for convenient channel changing, finding out what's on TV, avoiding commercials, and avoiding the dull parts of programs. Gratifications with moderate means include the use of RCDs to avoid specific individuals or parts of programs, and to catch desirable program segments or forms, including music videos. Gratifications with the lowest means concern the use of RCDs for non-directed play (playing with buttons) or to annoy other viewers.

Factor Analysis

The results of the factor analysis of the RCD gratification items are presented in Table 2. The analysis used principal components analysis with a varimax rotation. Items were assigned to a particular factor if their strongest loading was on that factor, the loading was above .4, and the loading was at least twice as strong on that factor as on any other factor. Only items assigned to a specific factor are included in Table 2. The factor analysis produced a ten factor solution, which accounted for 54.9% of the variance. However, following the above criterion meant that none of the 47 items could be assigned to factors 8, 9, and 10.

Table 2 about here

Factor 1 (selective avoidance) included six items related to the avoidance of unpleasant stimuli, including politicians, political ads, news reporters, and "people you don't agree with." Factor 2 (annoying others) included four items focusing on the use of RCDs to annoy or control other viewers as well as one non-directed play item (something to do with my hands). Factor 3 (finding out what's on television) included four items highlighting the use of RCDs to scan the available viewing options and two additional items emphasizing convenience. Factor 4 (getting more from television) included three items focusing on the capacity of RCDs to make viewing more interesting and less boring. Factor 5 (avoiding commercials) included two items specifying importance of RCDs in commercial zapping. Factor 6 (accessing music videos) included three items focusing on the used of RCDs to see more music videos. Finally, factor 7 (accessing television news) included four items showing that RCDs make it easier to access newscasts and weather reports.

The items loading on each factor were multiplied by their loadings and then summed to produce each of seven RCD gratification variables: selective avoidance (alpha = .89), annoying others (alpha = .85), finding out what's on television (alpha = .76), getting more from television (alpha = .83), avoiding commercials (alpha = .81), accessing music videos (alpha = .90), and accessing television news (alpha = .76).

Regression Analyses

The hierarchical regressions reported in Table 3 indicate that media reference foreground variables (RCD gratifications), entered after the other variable blocks, were the strongest predictors of grazing, multiple-program viewing, and total RCD use.

Table 3 about here

The RCD gratifications block accounted for 17% of the variance in grazing, 16.5% of variance in multiple-program viewing, and 21.2% of the variance in total RCD use. Despite being entered into the regression analysis before the gratifications block, the other significant blocks--television affinity and habitual media exposure--taken together accounted for only 9.4% of the variance in grazing, 10.1% of variance in multiple-program viewing, and 12.1% of the variance in total RCD use. Statistically significant ($p < .01$) beta weights were found on all three criterion variables for two RCD gratifications: getting more from television and avoiding commercials. Significant beta weights were found for two criterion variables (grazing and total RCD use) for two other RCD gratifications: selective avoidance and finding out what's on television.

Discussion

These results are clearly supportive of hypothesis 1. Even after controlling for the influence of general background, general foreground, and media reference background variables, the RCD gratifications identified in this study were significantly related to all three measures of RCD use. Getting more from

television, avoiding commercials, selective avoidance, and finding out what's on television were the specific gratifications most strongly related to RCD use. Although the respondents expressed high levels of agreement to statements emphasizing the convenience of RCDs, these items were not especially important items in the factor analysis. Conversely, items on the use of RCDs to annoy others and to avoid some stimuli received little overall support, but do identify distinct gratifications.

An especially substantial findings was that the strongest gratification produced by the factor analysis was for the selective avoidance of unpleasant stimuli, including politicians, political ads, news reporters, and others. The concepts of selective exposure/avoidance are of considerable importance in communication research (Zillmann & Bryant, 1985) and they are central to long standing arguments supporting a limited effects model of media impact (Klapper, 1960). The results of this study show that selective avoidance is a distinct motivation for using a RCD and is significantly related to total RCD use.

Equally consequential was the finding that the three strongest loadings on the selective avoidance factor all concerned the desire to avoid political information, especially political advertising. Prior research has established a positive relationship between exposure to mediate political information and the acquisition of political knowledge (Atkin, Galloway & Nayman, 1976; Becker & Dunwoody, 1982; Chaffee, 1975; Culbertson & Stempel, 1986; Patterson & McClure, 1976; Quarles, 1979; Tan, 1983; Zukin & Snyder, 1984). Thus, the clear tendency for the

remote control to be used to avoid political information is a cause for concern in a era of declining political knowledge and participation.

Although these results show a clear relationship between RCD gratifications and RCD use, some limitations regarding the sample should be noted. First, it is likely that the use of undergraduate respondents significantly reduced the impact of demographic variables, in particular age and income, because of limited variation. Second, the use of this age group has probably increased the significance of certain kinds of gratifications, in particular, the accessing of music videos and the use of RCDs to annoy others. Finally, it is also likely that the levels of RCD use found in this study do not generalize to other age groups (Heeter & Greenberg, 1985). Clearly, future research needs to focus on a population of greater diversity.

References

Ainslie, P. (1988a, September). Confronting a nation of grazers. Channels, pp. 54-57.

Ainslie, P. (1988b, September). The new TV viewer. Channels, p. 53.

Atkin, C. K., Galloway, J., & Nayman, O. B. (1976). News media exposure, political knowledge and campaign interest. Journalism Quarterly, 53, 231-237.

Becker, L. B., & Dunwoody, S. (1982). Media use, public affairs knowledge and voting in a local election. Journalism Quarterly, 59, 212-218.

Becker, L.B., & Schoenbach, K. (1989). Audience responses to media diversification: Coping with plenty. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Boyd, D.A., Straubhaar, J.D., & Lent, J.A. (1989). Videocassette recorders in the third world. New York: Longman.

Burghi, M. (1988, September). The remotest idea. Channels, p. 55.

Chaffee, S. H. (1975). The diffusion of political information. In S. C. Chaffee (Ed.), Political communication: Issues and strategies for research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Culbertson, H. M., & Stempel, G. H., III. (1986). How media use and reliance affect knowledge level. Communication Research, 13, 579-602.

Greenberg, B.S., & Heeter, C. (1987). VCRs and young people. American Behavioral Scientist, 30, 509-21.

Grotta, G.L, & Newsom, D. (1982). How does cable television in the home relate to other media use patterns? Journalism

Quarterly, 59, 588-91, 609.

Heeter, C., & Greenberg, B.S. (1985). Profiling the zappers. Journal of Advertising Research, 25(2), pp. 15-19.

Horwitz, R. B. (1989). The irony of regulatory reform. New York: Oxford.

Kim, Y.K., Baran, S.J., & Massey, K.K. (1988). Impact of the VCR on control of television viewing. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 32, 351-58.

Klapper, J.T. (1960). The effects of mass communication. New York: Free Press.

Levy, M.R. (1980a). Home video recorders: A user survey. Journal of Communication, 30(4), 23-27.

Levy, M.R. (1980b). Program playback preferences in VCR households. Journal of Broadcasting, 24, 327-36.

Levy, M.R. (1981). Home video recorders and time shifting. Journalism Quarterly, 58, 401-05.

Levy, M.R. (1987). Some problems of VCR research. American Behavioral Scientist, 30, 461-70.

Levy, M.R., & Gunter, B. (1988). Home video and the changing nature of the television audience. London: John Libbey.

McLeod, J.M., & Becker, L.B. (1974). Testing the validity of gratification measures through political effects analysis. In J.G. Blumbler & E. Katz (Eds.), The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research (pp. 137-164). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Palmgreen, P., Wenner, L.A., & Rosengren, K.E. (1985). Uses and gratifications research: The past ten years. In K.E.

Rosengren, L.A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), Media Gratifications Research (pp. 11-37). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patterson, T. E., & McClure, R. D. (1976). The unseeing eye: The myth of television power in national elections. New York: Putnam.

Quarles, R. C. (1979). Mass media use and voting behavior: The accuracy of political perceptions among first-time and experienced voters. Communication Research, 6, 407-436.

Rogers, E.M. (1986). Communication technology: The new media in society. New York: Free Press.

Rogers, E.M., & Shoemaker, F.F. (1971). Communication of innovations. New York: Free Press.

Rubin, A.M. (1981). An examination of television viewing motivations. Communication Research, 8, 141-163.

Rubin, A.M., & Bantz, C.R. (1987). Utility of videocassette recorders. American Behavioral Scientist, 30, 471-85.

Rubin, A.M., & Rubin, R.B. (1982). Older persons' TV viewing patterns and motivations. Communication Research, 9, 287-313.

Salmons, S. (1982, August 12). If viewers tune out TV ads. New York Times, p. D1.

Sparkes, V. (1983). Public perception of and reaction to multichannel cable television service. Journal of Broadcasting, 27, 163-75.

Tan, A. S. (1983). Media use and political orientations of ethnic groups. Journalism Quarterly, 60, 126-132.

Walker, J.R. (1988). Inheritance effects in the new media

environment. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media 32, 391-401.

Wenner, L.A. (1985). Transaction and media gratifications research. In K.E. Rosengren, L.A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), Media Gratifications Research (pp. 73-94). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Williams, F. (1983). The communications revolution. New York: New American Library.

Williams, F. (1989). The new communications, 2nd Ed. Belmont CA: Wadsworth.

Williams, F., Phillips, A.F., & Lum, P. (1985). Gratifications associated with new communication technologies. In K.E. Rosengren, L.A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.). Media gratifications research: Current perspectives (pp. 241-52). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Yorke, D.A., & Kitchen, P.J. (1985). Channel flickers and video speeders. Journal of Advertising Research, 25(2), 21-25.

Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (1985). Selective exposure to communication. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zukin, C., & Snyder, R. (1984). Passive learning: When the media environment is the message. Public Opinion Quarterly, 48, 629-638.

Table 1

M	SD	RCD Gratification Items
5.607	.881	change channels without getting up
5.198	.957	to check out what's on TV
5.068	1.145	easier to control what I see on TV
4.980	1.095	see what's on other stations
4.664	1.327	it makes it easier to watch TV
4.582	1.310	I don't watch as many commercials
4.499	1.370	it helps me avoid TV commercials
4.499	1.449	I can zap annoying commercials
4.490	1.326	find out what's on without looking
4.365	1.425	watch a greater variety of cable
4.268	1.552	it makes it easier to use my VCR
4.224	1.342	avoid the dull parts of a program
4.204	1.405	avoid the boring parts of a program
4.154	1.732	easier to be a couch potato
4.108	1.556	get the mostout of cable TV
4.051	1.436	you don't need a TV listing
3.996	1.653	music video instead of a commercial
3.971	1.450	avoid the obnoxious people on TV
3.947	1.398	I don't miss good stuff
3.932	1.507	I get more out of watching TV
3.851	1.420	catch the good parts of a program
3.743	1.480	change actor I don't like comes on
3.701	1.509	TV doesn't have to be as boring
3.677	1.446	change channels news story no like
3.673	1.600	more use videos recording stars
3.642	1.474	change channels politician
3.620	1.587	I see more music videos
3.563	1.443	catch the weather almost anytime
3.547	1.412	change channels news reporter
3.477	1.531	makes television more interesting
3.466	1.536	more control over the TV networks
3.437	1.697	zap someone on TV that I don't like
3.396	1.544	channels when political ads come on
3.284	1.537	I can compare newscasts
3.279	1.500	change political ads I disagree
3.251	1.673	sports instead of a commercial
3.224	1.374	I get to see more news
3.211	1.434	avoid people I don't agree with
3.160	1.425	I can catch the news almost any time
2.895	1.470	I like most electronic gadgets
2.800	1.547	I can create my own program
2.796	1.489	control what others are watching
2.563	1.408	something to do with my hands
2.503	1.518	I enjoy playing with the buttons
2.431	1.458	tease other people
2.345	1.502	annoy members of my family with it
2.268	1.356	I can annoy my friends with it

Table 2
Factor Analysis Remote Control Gratification Items

	F 1	F 2	F 3	F 4	F 5	F 6	F 7
RCDG45	.85	.11	.12	.09	.04	.15	.04
RCDG31	.74	.10	.08	.20	.21	.11	.00
RCDG15	.72	.15	.13	.14	.11	.01	.11
RCDG46	.71	.17	.11	.10	.15	.11	.10
RCDG32	.63	.09	.24	.14	.24	.18	-.01
RCDG41	.53	.26	.12	.23	.16	.18	.13
RCDG25	.12	.86	.04	.03	.07	.07	.08
RCDG9	.11	.80	.10	-.03	.15	.04	.04
RCDG2	.07	.75	.02	.04	.09	.06	.05
RCDG40	.19	.67	.14	.12	-.02	.12	.06
RCDG20	.16	.48	.06	.19	.01	.11	.02
RCDG28	.10	.08	.70	.10	.01	.11	.08
RCDG12	.09	-.02	.63	.19	.16	.11	.11
RCDG16	.15	.01	.61	.16	.28	.13	.11
RCDG8	.07	.03	.57	.10	.12	-.01	-.04
RCDG43	.13	.11	.52	.09	.07	.10	.10
RCDG24	.09	.14	.45	.06	.05	.00	.00
RCDG30	.20	.05	.30	.68	.15	.07	.18
RCDG11	.17	.10	.23	.65	.17	.09	.13
RCDG27	.17	.18	.27	.60	.15	.15	.19
RCDG3	.21	.14	.13	.17	.66	.20	.13
RCDG34	.28	.06	.24	.13	.64	.19	.12
RCDG23	.18	.10	.12	.14	.10	.84	.12
RCDG38	.19	.15	.08	.12	.11	.86	.20
RCDG7	.12	.11	.10	.03	.23	.76	.09
RCDG37	.04	.12	.06	.09	.07	.09	.85
RCDG6	-.02	.05	.08	.10	.12	.09	.68
RCDG14	.07	.00	.08	.14	.03	.04	.56
RCDG47	.20	.01	.08	.17	.05	.21	.49

Table 2 continued

I like to use the remote control. . .

RCDG1 = because it makes it easier to control what I see on TV.
RCDG2 = because I can annoy members of my family with it.
RCDG3 = because it helps me avoid TV commercials.
RCDG4 = because I enjoy playing with the buttons.
RCDG5 = because I don't miss as much of good stuff on other stations.
RCDG6 = because I can catch the news almost any time.
RCDG7 = because I can catch a music video instead of a commercial.
RCDG8 = because I can change channels without getting up.
RCDG9 = because it's fun to tease other people watching the same TV set.
RCDG10 = because I can zap someone on TV that I don't like.
RCDG11 = because it makes television more interesting.
RCDG12 = to check out what's on TV.
RCDG13 = because it helps me get the most out of cable TV.
RCDG14 = because I can compare newscasts.
RCDG15 = because I can change channels when political ads that I don't agree with come on.
RCDG16 = because I can see what's on all of the other stations.
RCDG17 = because I can change channels when some actor that I don't like comes on.
RCDG18 = because I feel that I have more control over the TV networks.
RCDG19 = because I can zap annoying commercials.
RCDG20 = because it gives me something to do with my hands while I'm watching TV.
RCDG21 = because I can avoid the dull parts of a program.
RCDG22 = because I can catch sports coverage almost anytime.
RCDG23 = because I can catch videos of the top recording stars almost anytime.
RCDG24 = because it makes it easier to be a couch potato when that's what I want.
RCDG25 = because I can annoy my friends with it.
RCDG26 = because I can avoid some of the obnoxious people on TV.
RCDG27 = because TV doesn't have to be as boring.
RCDG28 = because because I can find out what's on without looking at the TV listings in the paper or the TV Guide.
RCDG29 = because it makes it easier to use my VCR.
RCDG30 = because I get more out of watching TV.
RCDG31 = because I can change channels when political ads come on.
RCDG32 = because I can change channels when some news story that I don't like comes on.
RCDG33 = because I can create my own program by choosing bits and pieces from several different channels.
RCDG34 = because I don't have to watch as many commercials.
RCDG35 = because I like most electronic gadgets.
RCDG36 = because I can catch just the good parts of a program.
RCDG37 = because I get to see more news.

Table 2 continued

I like to use the remote control. . .

RCDG38 = because I see more music videos.
RCDG39 = because it makes it easier to watch TV.
RCDG40 = because it makes it possible to control what others in the room are watching.
RCDG41 = because I can avoid people I don't agree with.
RCDG42 = because I can avoid the boring parts of a program.
RCDG43 = because you don't need a TV listing.
RCDG44 = because it makes it easier to watch a greater variety of cable channels.
RCDG45 = because I can change channels when some politician that I don't like comes on.
RCDG46 = because I can change channels when some news reporter that I don't like comes on.
RCDG47 = because I can catch the weather almost anytime.

TABLE 3

Multiple Correlations and Beta Weights for

Predictors of Grazing, Multiple Program Viewing, & Total RCD Use

	Grazing		M.P. Viewing		RCD Use	
	R	Beta	R	Beta	R	Beta
General Background: (Demographic Variables)						
Sex(1=male, 2=female)	-.09	.03	-.09	.02	-.12	.00
Age	-.11	-.08	-.08	-.02	-.10	-.05
Household Income	.03	-.01	-.02	-.06	.01	-.03
Race(1=non-white, 2=white)	.04	-.01	-.04	-.08	-.01	-.07
General Foreground:						
Television Affinity	.22*	.10	.22*	.08	.23*	.08
Media Reference Background: (Habitual Media Exposure)						
Television Exposure	.12*	.07	.10	.02	.11	.04
Cable Viewing	.26*	.16*	.26*	.13*	.31*	.18*
VCR Use	.09	.05	.06	.01	.07	.02
Media Reference Foreground: (RCD Gratifications)						
Selective Avoidance	.18*	-.15*	.24*	-.12	.23*	-.17*
Annoying Others	.09	-.06	.19*	.04	.16*	.00
Finding Out What's On	.40*	.22*	.32*	.09	.39*	.15*
Getting More From TV	.35*	.14*	.36*	.15*	.41*	.19*
Avoiding Commercials	.39*	.25*	.44*	.29*	.48*	.34*
Accessing Music Videos	.25*	-.02	.37*	.13*	.34*	.05
Accessing TV news	.24*	.08	.23*	.03	.26*	.05

Variance Accounted for by Each Block (Adjusted R^2)	Grazing	M.P. Viewing	RCD Use
Demographic Variables	.010	.010	.016
Television Atttitudes	.044*	.046*	.047*
Habitual Media Exposure	.050*	.055*	.074*
RCD Gratifications	.170*	.165*	.212*
Total Variance Accounted for	.274	.276	.349

*Significant at $p < .01$.